

## **REMARKS:**

The Office Action dated April 19, 2007, has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the following remarks have been prepared, which are intended to be fully responsive to the Office Action.

### **Summary of the Office Action and Status of the Claims**

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-9 are pending in the application. Claims 4 and 9 have been cancelled. Thus, upon entry of this paper in the record, claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-8 will be pending.

In the Office Action, the drawings have been objected to because reference number “9” is used to designate a flexible hose (page 2, line 4 of the specification) and a handle (page 2, line 17 of the specification) as shown in FIGS. 1 and 2. The specification has been objected to because reference number “70” should be used after the element “grill” throughout the specification. Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP9-164100, and as being anticipated by WO-02-051296. Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over several U.S. and Japanese patent references. On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner has noted that claims 3 and 4 are substantially identical and would be rejected on the basis of double patenting.

### **Drawing Objections**

The drawings have been objected to because reference number “9” is used to designate a flexible hose (page 2, line 4 of the specification), and a handle (page 2, line 17 of the specification) as shown in FIGS. 1 and 2. In response to that objection, the specification has been amended so that the “handle” is designated as reference number 4 instead of reference number 9. No changes to the drawings are necessary. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings are respectfully requested.

### **Specification**

The specification has been objected to because reference number “70” should be used after the element “grill” throughout the specification. In response to that objection, the specification has been amended to include reference number 70 after the element “grill.” Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the specification are respectfully requested.

### **Rejection of Claims 8 and 9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner contends that it is unclear which portion of the claim is the preamble. In response, claim 8 has been amended to include a preamble. Claim 9 has been cancelled thereby rendering the rejection of that claim as moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 8 is in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under § 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

### **Rejection of Claim 8 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP9-164100, and as being anticipated by WO-02-051296. For the following reasons, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

As recited in amended claim 8, the invention includes a cyclone dust collector installed “proximate the double-bent handle tube,” The cited references JP9-164100 and WO02-051296 do not disclose a cyclone dust collector on the handle tube. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 8 is not anticipated by the cited references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under § 102(b) are respectfully requested.

**Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,195,835 to *Song et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,557,399 to *Wolf* and JP9-164100. That rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

First, the *Wolf* patent and the JP9-164100 patent reference do not disclose a cyclone duct collector. Second, while the *Song et al.* patent appears to disclose a cyclone dust collector, the cyclone does not have the same structure as recited in claim 1, i.e., being “installed proximate the double-bent portion of the handle.” In the present invention, the cyclone dust collector allows improved use of space, and it allows the cyclone to be cleaned more easily than the device disclosed in the *Song et al.* patent without burdening the user’s hands because the double-bent handle tube can be installed with an accessory assembly when the user performs cleaning by separating the extension tube from the handle tube and attaching the accessory assembly. Thus, it cannot be said that the combination of the three cited references renders claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-8 as being unpatentable (claim 9 has been cancelled). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

**Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 3 and 4 are indicated as being substantially duplicative. That is the result of cancelling dependent claim 2 and changing the dependency of claim 4, which was originally dependent on claim 2, to depend from claim 1. Claim 4 has been cancelled.